

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action dated March 26, 2008, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

The indicated of allowability of claims 3-11 and 14-22 is noted with appreciation.

In view of this indication, claim 3 has been placed in independent form by incorporation of its subject matter into claim 1 and claim 14 has been placed in independent form by incorporation of its subject matter into claim 12. The dependent claims have been amended, where necessary, to provide correct dependency.

Claim 21 has not been amended and the rejections of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 101 are respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that claims 21 and 22 are not directed to non-statutory subject matter, and, in particular, are not directed to a machine. The only mention of a machine in claim 21 is in preamble, which refers to a method for operating the system of claim 12. Claims 21 and 22 do not include any apparatus limitations, and do not define a method and a system, which is the form of claim considered objectionable in MPEP 2173.05(p)II.

It is true that claim 21 is directed to a method for operating the system of claim 12. However, PTO rules

Appln. No. 10/593,869
Draft Amendment dated June 16, 2008
Reply to Office action of March 26, 2008

specifically permit such a claim. This is specifically stated in MPEP Section 608.01(n)III.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejections of claims 21 and 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn, that all of the claims now in the application allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:jnj
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\L\LUZZ\GNEDEKNO9\PTO\2008-6-16-DraftAmd.doc